

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/935,028	08/22/2001	Nicholas Paul Cowley	534334-014	9206	
27805 7	7590 01/05/2005		EXAMINER		
	HINE L.L.P.	PHU, PHUONG M			
	HOUSE PLAZA , N.E. COND STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
DAYTON, OF	H 45402		2631	2631	
			DATE MAILED: 01/05/200	•	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)	(K			
•		09/935,02	28	COWLEY ET AL.	GI.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
		Phuong F		2631				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the	cover sheet with the	correspondence add	dress			
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per tre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by start reply received by the Office later than three months after the may be departed term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no ever reply within the state iod will apply and wi atute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be utory minimum of thirty (30) d Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro lication to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely m the mailing date of this co				
Status								
·	/							
Dispositi	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>8 and 9</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	drawn from co			•			
Applicati	ion Papers							
10)	The specification is objected to by the Exam The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the contact that of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) the drawing(s) b rection is require	e held in abeyance. Sed if the drawing(s) is c	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CF	• •			
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
2) Notice 3) Information	et (s) te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ tr No(s)/Mail Date 12/27/01.	08)	4) Interview Summa. Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:		-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/935,028

Art Unit: 2631

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Limberg (5,852,477), in view of Waight (6,057,876).

-As per claim 1, see figure 1, and col. 5, lines 22-64, Limberg discloses a system having an input tuning range with a lower frequency limit and an upper frequency limit within a band located for television broadcasting wherein the system comprising:

an upconverter (3) for converting the input signal to an intermediate frequency signal whose frequency is higher than said upper frequency limit of said input tuning range (see col. 5, lines 27-33), and

downconverter (5, 7) for converting said intermediate frequency signal from said upconverter to in-phase and quadrature baseband signals (Re, Im).

Limberg does not disclose whether said upconverter having a local oscillator fundamental frequency which is greater than said upper frequency limit of said input tuning range.

Waight teaches using a local oscillator (25) for frequency upconverting (23) (see figure 1 and col. 3, lines 8-12).

Since Waight does not disclose how said upconverter is implemented, therefore, in an application for implementing said upconverter, it would have been obvious for one skilled in

Application/Control Number: 09/935,028 Page 3

Art Unit: 2631

the art to implement said upconverter using a local oscillator in frequency upconverting, as taught by Waight. In Limberg invention, in view of Waight, the fundamental frequency of the local oscillator should inherently be greater than said upper frequency limit of said input tuning range in order to obtain said intermediate frequency signal whose frequency is higher than said upper frequency limit of said input tuning range, as required.

-As per claim 2, Limberg discloses that said upconverter is a upconverter for selecting a desired channel and said downconverter is a downconverter (see col. 5, lines 33-51).

-As per claim 3, Limberg discloses that said upconverter is a upconverter and said downconverter is a downconverter for selecting a desired channel (see figure 1).

-As per claim 4, Limberg in view of Waight does not disclose whether said upconverter is arranged to convert said input tuning range to an intermediate frequency range having a lower frequency limit and an upper frequency limit less than twice said lower frequency limit of said intermediate frequency range. However, it would have been obvious that the one skilled in the art, when building or carrying out Limberg invention, in view of Waight, upon his design preference and within his skills, could select such that said upconverter is arranged to convert said input tuning range to an intermediate frequency range having a lower frequency limit and an upper frequency limit less than twice said lower frequency limit of said intermediate frequency range, or arranged in another frequency arrangement for said intermediate frequency range, as long as said intermediate frequency signal whose frequency is higher than said upper frequency limit of said input tuning range, as required.

-Regarding to claim 5, Limberg discloses that the system has an input (inputted to (3), said downconverter has an input (inputted to (5)), and there is no frequency filtering between said input of said tuner and said input of said downconverter (see figure 1).

-Regarding to claims 6 and 7, Limberg in view of Waight does not disclose first and second baseband filters for filtering said in-phase and quadrature baseband signals from said downconverter.

However, using a filter, e.g., a lowpass filter, for filtering noise and undesired signals, which might affect a system performance, out of the frequency band of system output, is wellknown in the art, and the examiner takes Official Notice.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art, when building or carrying out Limberg invention, in view of Waight, to implement first and second filters, e.g., lowpass filters, for filtering noise and undesired signals from bandwith of said in-phase and quadrature baseband signals from said downconverter if the noise and undesired signals occur and might affect further processing of the system.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8 and 9 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be 3. allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong Phu whose telephone number is 571-272-3009. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-2:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on 571-272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Phuong Phu Primary Examiner Art Unit 2631

Thung Phu Phuong Phu

12/03/04